

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the present application, none of which have been amended.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Coverability Analysis Using Symbolic Model Checking* (NNRD40785) in view of *Carter et al.* (US 6,249,907). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 1 (and similarly Claims 6 and 11) recites steps of "in response to a breakpoint set by a user, wherein said breakpoint is set within an application program source code monitored by said debugger, determining whether or not said breakpoint is set on a statement listed in an unreachable statement list" and "in response to a determination that said breakpoint is set on a statement listed in an unreachable statement list, displaying an unreachable breakpoint warning to said user by said debugger." Thus, the claimed invention is related to steps executed within a debugger, and specifically in response to a breakpoint set on a statement listed in an unreachable statement list.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the above-mentioned claimed steps are substantially disclosed by NNRD40785 in paragraphs 1-2. However, NNRD40785 is related to the usage of Symbolic Model Checking in Coverability Analysis (lines 1-3) and not related to a software debugger as claimed. In fact, the word "debugger" is not found in the entire reference.

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the setting of a breakpoint was not explicitly disclosed by NNRD40785, but the Examiner asserts that the setting of a breakpoint was taught by *Carter*. Applicants agree with the Examiner that the setting of a breakpoint was not explicitly disclosed by NNRD40785. The word "breakpoint" is also not found in the entire NNRD40785 reference, which is further indicative to the fact that NNRD40785 is not related to a software debugger as claimed.

Furthermore, neither NNRD40785 nor *Carter* teaches or suggests the claimed unreachable statement list. Because the cited references, whether separately or combined, do not teach or suggest the claimed invention, the § 103 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 1 and 12 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against IBM Deposit Account No. 09-0465.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Cap. of Texas Hwy., suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78720-1720
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS